

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 369 261

FL 021 975

AUTHOR Battle, Jennifer
TITLE The Collaborative Nature of Language Learning and Meaning Making in Mexican-American Bilingual Kindergarteners' Storybook Discussions.
PUB DATE 4 Dec 93
NOTE 32p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Reading Conference (Charleston, SC, December 4, 1993).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Bilingual Education; *English (Second Language); *Interpersonal Communication; *Kindergarten Children; Limited English Speaking; *Mexican Americans; Participant Observation; Peer Relationship; Primary Education; Reading Aloud to Others; *Second Language Instruction; Spanish; *Story Reading; Story Telling; Teacher Role; Teacher Student Relationship

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to present a detailed description of Mexican-American bilingual kindergartners' discussions of stories read aloud by their teacher in the students' second language, which was English. Eighteen Mexican-American kindergartners with limited English proficiency were observed for 12 weeks during storytime, and their discussions and interactions were recorded on videotape and in field notes. The students and teacher were also interviewed at the beginning, middle, and end of the study. It was observed that conversations about stories took place throughout the story reading sessions, before the actual reading, during the reading of the story, and after the reading was finished. The students' conversations revolved around their familiarity with the literature, illustrations in the books, relevant personal experiences, features of the book, and language. Children used both Spanish and English in the discussions, and noticed differences between the two languages. Storytime in the bilingual classroom provided a rich and supportive social context for both first and second language use in authentic communicative discussion. Includes 8 tables on categories of topics and purposes served in the 12 story discussion. (Contains 22 references). (MDM)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

The Collaborative Nature of Language Learning and Meaning Making
in Mexican-American Bilingual Kindergartners' Storybook Discussions

Jennifer Battle
University of Texas at Austin

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Reading
Conference in Charleston, South Carolina on December 4, 1993.

FL021975-
"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL
IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN
GRANTED BY

Jennifer Battle

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.

The Collaborative Nature of Language Learning and Meaning Making in Mexican American Bilingual Kindergartners' Storybook Discussions

Both qualitative and empirical research studies have established that reading stories aloud to children and providing opportunities to talk about those stories enhance children's language growth (e.g., Chomsky, 1972; Feitelson, Kita, & Goldstein, 1986; Nino & Bruner, 1976), and can support the development of critical, literate thinking (Short & Pierce, 1980; Wells, 1990). The nature of the interaction between teacher and children surrounding stories appears critical to those learnings (Cochran-Smith, 1984; Martinez & Roser, 1985). Story reading events in which teachers read aloud quality literature and give children time to talk about the stories create optimum conditions for second language acquisition as well (Krashen, 1982), i.e., a natural and rich context in which children can listen to and use the second language for authentic communicative purposes in a low risk setting.

Consistent with Vygotsky's (1978) social constructivist theory, the interactions or dialogues about stories read aloud should provide opportunities for students and teachers to pose questions, clarify meaning, enrich background knowledge, and make connections to their personal experiences and other literary works. These experiences serve first as an external activity in which children participate socially, and second, as models of text interpretation and language use for children to internalize and transform over time.

Research into classroom discussions of stories read aloud provides evidence that children do engage in thoughtful and insightful inquiry of meaning when afforded the opportunity to do so (Alvermann & Olson, 1988; Eeds & Wells, 1989). For example one study reported that fifth and sixth grade children who were given the opportunity to participate in literature discussion groups freely expressed their responses (Eeds & Wells, 1989), shared personal connection, constructed a meaning for the text, changed opinions as a result of listening to various alternative views, questioned, predicted, hypothesized, made inferences, and evaluated the text.

Evidence for young children's thoughtful consideration of story is burgeoning (Farest, 1990; Lehr, 1988, 1990; Martinez, Roser, Hoffman, & Battle, 1992). First, there is evidence that children can and do identify themes of stories. Lehr (1988;1990) explores the depth of young children's understanding of theme from the stories their teachers/parents read. She found, though not through story discussion in a group setting, that kindergarteners were able to match books with similar themes 80% of the time, and most were able to summarize the story. Seventy percent of the kindergarten children were also aware of the internal motivations of the characters. As a general rule the children were more successful in generating a theme for realistic fiction selections than for folktales.

Lehr's study (1990), conducted with ten preschool children, revealed that these younger subjects were not able to verbalize theme statements, but were able to talk about thematic elements, indicating some developing sense of the theme.

In addition, there is evidence that young children contribute inferences and insights during conversations about books (McGee, 1990; Martinez, Roser, Hoffman, & Battle, 1992). McGee (1992) found that the first grade children she studied "constructed simple meaning," shared personal associations, formed hypotheses and predictions, engaged in retelling story events and evaluated the stories they heard. Sustained talk occurred in response to a teacher-posed interpretive question. Martinez et al (1992) demonstrated that the use of response journals and a response framework during storytime, broadened the types of responses children made. When children were invited to share their observations and puzzlements, their responses became more varied, and their wonderings became the basis for discussion. There is less evidence that children work collaboratively toward story interpretation during story conversations.

In addition, researchers have been at least intuitively aware that particular texts may influence the quantity and quality of children's responses to stories (Cullinan, Jaggar, & Strickland, 1974; Eeds & Wells, 1989; McGee, 1992; Morrow, 1988; Seawell, 1985). Genre, particularly realistic fiction, as well as strong storylines and well-defined characters, have stimulated story talk for readers. This research has been conducted with children who are listening to stories and talking together in their native language. Few studies have made a detailed examination of story discussions among second language learners. I wanted to know what happens when stories are read aloud in English to children who are most comfortable speaking a different language.

The purpose of this observational investigation was to attempt a detailed description of Mexican-American bilingual Kindergarten children's discussions of stories read aloud by their teacher in their second language. To guide the study, I posed two broad questions. First I asked, what are the characteristics of bilingual children's conversations about stories, i.e., the aspects of the stories they chose to talk about; the perceived intents of their conversations, and how the children linked their personal experiences to the stories they heard. Second, I asked how the teacher and the bilingual children collaborated in constructing their interpretations of the stories. Specifically, I worked to understand the participation structures of the discussion (e.g. turn-taking patterns and topic initiation patterns), the teacher's role in encouraging and sustaining conversations, and the participants uses of their two languages to communicate messages about stories in this setting.

Method

For this observational study I assumed the role of participant observer for 12 weeks during storytime, observing and recording extensive field notes in a bilingual (English and Spanish) kindergarten with eighteen Mexican-American bilingual children and their bilingual teacher. This classroom was selected because it was recommended by the Assistant Superintendent of the large urban school district. The teacher offered a supportive read-aloud context characterized by frequent exposure to quality children's literature, acceptance of children's responses to stories in the natural language, and optional participation in dialogue about stories.

All eighteen of the children in this classroom were Mexican-American. Seventeen of the children qualified for free or reduced lunch and breakfast. The results of the IDEA Test of Oral Language Proficiency (Ballard & Tighe, 1989) administered by the school during the pre-kindergarten year, revealed that there was a range of proficiencies in each language among the participants. All of the children demonstrated limited English proficiency ($n=11$) or were non-English speakers ($n=7$); of these, six were fluent Spanish speakers, nine demonstrated limited Spanish proficiency, and only three were non-Spanish speakers. Consistent with district policy, these children received bilingual instruction by a certified bilingual teacher. Instruction was provided in L1 for language arts, math, science and social studies. The bilingual teacher also set aside daily time for reading aloud quality children's literature in English, and for talking about the stories. Comprehension was ensured for non-English speakers by telling the story first in Spanish, using the book illustrations as additional support, before reading aloud in English. During an informal interview, the teacher told me:

I'm asking my English speakers to do what my Spanish speakers do all the time. I have found there is definitely an advantage to telling the story first in Spanish and then reading it in English. I don't have to stop to translate. I mean, it made the children think in both languages which I thought was great. I feel like being in this classroom they know that their language is valued. I feel like they don't stop learning Spanish. It's there. They appreciate it. They want to speak it, and they

come with more of a background than a child who doesn't speak Spanish at home.

For this study, five experts in children's literature evaluated a set of 50 books for the presence/absence of five qualities: a) high quality text and illustrations, b) alignment with kindergartners' cognitive development and interests, c) favorable representations of ethnic groups, d) substantive thematic content, and e) likely to elicit response from kindergarten children. The eleven books that matched the guidelines most successfully, according to the five experts, served as the read-aloud selections for the twelve videotaped story discussions. I chose the twelfth book, Family Pictures, because it matched the cultural background of the children.

The principal sources of data were the collection of video- and audio-tapes of the storytime interactions once per week for the 12 week duration of the study. In addition, audiotapes of storytime were collected on two other days per week to provide corroborating data for verification of the findings. I conducted audio-taped informal interviews with all the children in small groups of three, as well as with the teacher. These interviews were conducted at the beginning, the middle, and the end of the investigation, and served to clarify the participants' perspectives about the stories, and about the interactions themselves. The teacher was asked to keep a journal of her personal responses to the books she read to the children. The 12 audio- and video-taped discussions and audio-taped interviews were completely transcribed for analysis.

To answer my research questions, I coded transcriptions of the twelve video-taped interactions into message units (MU'S) and conversation units (CU'S). A message unit (MU) was defined as the minimal unit of conversational meaning contributed by a speaker about the story (adapted from Martinez, Roser, Hoffman, & Battle, 1992). For example, "That sounds like me!" counted as one MU. In addition, an expression of agreement, such as "Uh-huh." also counted as an MU. A CU was composed of sustained discourse (more than one speaker contributing a message unit) in which there was an identifiable focus. The following transcript excerpt from the introduction to The Little Red Hen, illustrates these two coding procedures:

CU Topic Label: Association with Personal Experience

T: Cuando les leí éste libro? [When did I read this book to you?] (1 MU)

C: Cuando we studied pan. [When we studied bread.] (1 MU)

C: Cuando era día de las gallinas. [When it was the day of the hens.] (1 MU)

T: He says I could have read it when we studied about eggs and chickens. I could have read it then. There's a lot of different times that I could have read it. Lo leí cuando estudiamos pan de trigo. [I read it when we studied wheat bread.] (4 MU)

This coding procedure provided a way of discovering the topics and purposes of the conversations, and the patterns of teacher/child participation within each CU.

Analyses of the data were both quantitative and qualitative in nature. Using the constant comparison method (Glaser & Strauss, 1967), I searched for and identified patterns in a) aspects of stories the children discussed and to what end, b) the participation structures of the discussions, c) the teacher's strategies as discussion guide, and d) the participants' uses of English and Spanish.

Quantitative analyses was used to determine frequencies of: a) topic categories and purposes, b) participation patterns of teacher and children, c) topic initiations, and d) teacher strategy use. Informal interviews with the participants were used for the triangulation of data, and provided the participants' own perspectives with regard to the stories, and to the interactions themselves.

Results

What were the characteristics of storybook discussions?

Conversations about stories took place throughout the story reading sessions--before the actual reading, during the reading of the story, and after the reading was finished. Results of the analyses revealed that the bilingual children and their teacher were eager participants in the discussions. The twelve story discussions were coded into a total of 568 conversation units (CU's). A wide range of topics were introduced into discussion. Six major categories emerged from the data:

- a) talk about the children's **familiarity with literature**,
- b) talk about the **illustrations** in the books,
- c) talk about the **literary elements**,
- d) talk about **personal experience** connections,
- e) talk about **book features**, and

f) talk about **language**.

An overwhelming percentage of conversations dealt with literary elements (30.2%). These bilingual children seemed to prefer discussing the characters and events in the stories within their story worlds. While the children did not step back to analyze how or why an author may have created a character, or generate theme statements, they did talk about character's motives and feelings, and engaged in theme-related discussions. Talk concerning the illustrations in the picture books was the second most frequent category of topics (20.7%). The illustrations that accompany picture books shared aloud were an integral part of the storytime routine for the bilingual children. The illustrations were supportive in carrying the meaning of the story across the two languages of the classroom, and they provided opportunities for the children to describe their own observations. Interviews with the children illuminated their importance:

J: Do you like to listen to stories?

C: Yes.

J: Talk about it. What do you like about it?

C: The pictures.

C: I like about it 'cause there's wonderful pictures.

C: I like the colors of the paper of the pictures.

J: Yeah. The colors of the illustrations...

C: I like books 'cause I see all of those kind of pictures and I want to read all of them.

I: Yeah.

C: I like them because they are wonderful books that you can look at and then when you grow up, you're going to learn how to read and you're going to be the best in the whole world because you will read books a lot.

Purposes served by discussions. Coding procedures allowed me to infer from the transcripts the purposes being served by the conversations (e.g., what a conversation seemed to be accomplishing). These inferred purposes were sorted into **nine** descriptive categories that are defined and illustrated with representative CU's. (See Table). Descriptors for the nine categories are listed below:

Telling about information related to story topics.

Description of observations in illustrations and narratives.

Association to personal experience and other literary works

Criticism of specific events and of stories, in general.

Inquiry about aspects of story events and characters that seemed unclear.

Prediction of storylines.

Enactment of story language and story action.

Interpretation of character motives and conflict situations.

Wondering about possible explanations for character actions and story events.

A wide variety of purposes was served by discussions of the twelve books. Children able to use both of their languages to accomplish many communicative purposes in talking about stories. The storytime setting provided frequent and varied opportunities for

children to construct meaning, demonstrate expertise, display their knowledge, attempt interpretations. The most frequent purposes served by discussion were association (20%), description (19%), interpretation (14%), and inquiry (12%).

How did the children and their teacher collaborate in constructing interpretations of stories?

Frequency of participation. A comparison of the children's contributions to story conversations (MU'S), and those MU'S contributed by the teacher showed that the children and the teacher contributed in approximately equal proportions across the twelve story discussions. In discussions of stories familiar to the children from previous exposures (e.g., Ira Sleeps Over, Little Red Hen), the children contributed more talk than their teacher. Children in this classroom, then, were given increased opportunities to express themselves when compared to traditional classroom discussions in which teacher/child talk reflects a ratio of 66%/33% (Cazden, 1988).

Patterns of turn-taking and topic initiation. Patterns of turn-taking were identified for each CU and revealed that typical interaction patterns involved alternating teacher and child turn-taking, often with two or three children contributing turns in sequence. Although the teacher initiated over half (approximately 60%) of the CU'S, she often did so by inviting children to talk about their opinions and thoughts, and responses based on their own opinions. In 24 of the total number of CU'S (N=568), occurring across the twelve story discussions, the children engaged in student-to-student interactions with no intervening teacher turns. These seeds

of cross discussion among young children may be powerful indicators of the emergence of independent functioning.

Teacher strategies for initiating and sustaining discussion.

I coded each teacher-contributed MU according to the strategy she seemed to be using to initiate, encourage, and sustain children's talk (Martinez, Roser, Hoffman, & Battle 1992). Nine strategies emerged from the transcripts, many of which matched those observed by previous researcher during storytime. Definitions of these strategies are found on Table . Across the twelve stories, two strategies were most prevalent in this teacher's style as discussant: a) invites (18.5), and b) accepts student's response (28.5). Not only did she invite and listen to children's ideas, she communicated her interest in what they were saying by repeating, rephrasing, or extending children's talk with new bits of related information.

Uses of English and Spanish in story discussion.

The transcripts of the twelve story discussions revealed that the children used their two languages for many and varied purposes. During story talk, the teacher made no overt demands on children's language productions and participation in discussion was optional. The teacher did not correct their language forms nor demand that the children speak in a specific language. Rather, the focus of the discussions was on their ideas about the stories (as described above). However, three other purposeful uses of the two languages emerged from the data:

a) **talk about language:** In these conversations children discussed language as a rule-governed system. They noticed that two languages were operating during storytime (i.e., they demonstrated

linguistic code awareness). They knew when they understood (or didn't understand) utterances spoken in each language. Children sought clarification about the print they saw in the books the teacher read to them, they explored and played with the sounds in the words they heard in the stories, and they talked about the meanings of unfamiliar words. Children also recognized when certain language forms didn't sound right to their ear.

b) talk to communicate across two languages: Because of the variability of the language characteristics of the children in this classroom, accommodations needed to be made to ensure comprehension of story talk by everyone present. The teacher took major responsibility for accomplishing bilingual understanding in this setting. She moved freely and with regularity between the two languages. Nevertheless, the children also participated in conversations in which translation, and demonstration of concepts was the focus. The children demonstrated flexibility in using their language resources from both languages to talk about stories. Children were cognizant of instances when meaning wasn't clear, and asked questions to seek confirmation about their building understandings.

c) talk to participate in the sounds of literature

The bilingual children used the storytime setting to notice and take pleasure in the language of literature. There were several ways in which the children participated in enacting the language of these stories. Children were observed to repeat phrases from the stories in their discussions, as well as during their free play. A few children enjoyed echoing the reading of the teacher. The predictable language

of the refrain in The Little Red Hen provided an opportunity for choral chanting in each of the languages.

Collaboration

With their teacher's interest and support, the kindergarten bilingual children engaged in exploratory talk, i.e., they collaborated in constructing group interpretations of stories. To illustrate how the children did this, I have included this excerpt from the discussion of Angelina Ballerina. The teacher and the children worked together to explain the motivation behind Angelina's remarkable change in behavior. Angelina is suddenly keeping her room clean and she is no longer late for dinner or for school:

T: Ahora sí está escuchando lo que dice su mamá. Le está haciendo caso y cuando su mamá le dice, rápido lo hace.
[Now she is really listening to what her mother says. She is minding her, and when her mother tells her, she does it quickly.]

C: You know why she does it?

T: Why?

C: If she don't do it, they might take her out.

C: The mother or the father might take her out.

T: You think they might take her out of the class?

C: She did it because she is happy now because she is in the dance class.

C: She wants to do it because she is too happy that she is going to school, and she's doing everything what her Mom says.

T: That's right. Katherine?

C: Cuando no lo hace ella, le van a llevar back el vestido.

[When she doesn't do it, they're going to take the dress back.]

T: Que suerte.! [What luck!]

C: She wants to do that.

C: When they bought that ballet dress, that's what they did for her. If she didn't want to help or go to school, and then they would take it back.

The children initiated the exploratory process by seeking to explain Angelina's change in behavior. With the support of their teacher, who responded as audience for their ideas, the children agreed and disagreed, they built on each other's responses, and they posed alternative ideas.

Conclusions

Storytime in this bilingual classroom provided a rich and supportive social context for both first and second language use in authentic communicative discussion. The critical role played by carefully-selected quality literature cannot be overlooked. These books engaged the children, and evoked a wide variety of purposeful talk through the children's concern for the characters in the stories and their problem situations. Because this teacher created a low-risk, non-evaluative context by accepting children's natural language choices, and opening discussion to their own ideas--their thoughts and feelings--the bilingual children were willing, not only to express their ideas about stories based on their knowledge and experience, but also, to collaborate in constructing interpretations of the stories. Through these conversations, the bilingual children clarified

meanings of stories and negotiated successful communication primarily in their second language. This study offers supporting evidence that the predictable and memorable language of quality literature may be a pathway to a second language, just as it supports the development of literacy understandings for young readers and writers.

References

- Cazden, C. B. (1988). Classroom discourse: The language of teaching and learning. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Chomsky, C. (1972). Stages in language development and reading exposure. Harvard Educational Review, 42, 1-33.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (1984). The making of a reader. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Cullinan, B., Jaggar, A. & Strickland, D. (1974). Language expansion for Black children in primary grades: A research report. Young Children, 98-112.
- Eeds, M. & Wells, D. (1989). Grand conversations: An exploration of meaning construction in literature study groups. Research in the Teaching of English, 4-29.
- Elley, W. B. & Mangubhai, F. (1983). The impact of reading on second language learning. Reading Research Quarterly, 19, 53-67.
- Farest, C. (1990). Talking and writing authors: Hispanic kindergarten children write in a literature-rich classroom. Unpublished dissertation, The University of Texas at Austin.
- Feitelson, D., Kita, B., & Goldstein, Z. (1986). Effects of listening to series stories of first graders' comprehension and use of language. Research in the Teaching of English, 30, 846-867.
- Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, Al L. (1967). The discovery of grounded theory. New York: Aldine.
- IDEA Oral Language Proficiency Test. (1989). Brea, CA: Ballard & Tighe.

- Krashen, S. (1982). Principles and practice in second language acquisition. New York: Pergamon Press.
- Lehr, S. (1988). The child's developing sense of theme as response to literature. Reading Research Quarterly, 23, 337-357.
- Lehr, S. (1990). Literature and the construction of meaning: The preschool child's developing sense of theme. Journal of Research in Childhood Education, 5, 37-46.
- McGee, L. (1992). An exploration of meaning construction in first graders' grand conversations. In C.K. Kinzer & D. J. Leu (Eds.), Literacy research, theory and practice: Views from many perspectives. Forty-first yearbook of the national Reading Conference (pp.177-186). Chicago: National Reading Conference.
- Martinez, M., & Roser, N. L. (1985). Roles adults play in preschoolers' response to literature. Language Arts, 62, 485-490.
- Martinez, M., Roser, N. L., Hoffman, J. V. & Battle, J. (1992). Fostering better book talk through response logs and a response framework: A case description. In C.K. Kinzer & D. J. Lew (Eds.), Literacy research, theory, and practice: Views from many perspectives. Forty first yearbook of the National Reading Conference (pp.303-312). Chicago: National Reading Conference.
- Ninio A., & Bruner, J. (1976). The achievement and antecedents of labelling. Journal of Child Language, 5, 1-15.
- Short, K. G., & Pierce, K. M. (1990). Talking about books: Creating literate communities. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

- Seawell, R. P. (1985). A micro-ethnographic study of a Spanish/English bilingual kindergarten in which literature and puppet play were used as a method of enhancing language growth. Unpublished dissertation, The University of Texas at Austin.
- Teale, W. H. (1986). Home background and young children's literacy development. In W. H. Teale & E. Sulzby (Eds.), Emergent Literacy: Writing and reading (pp. 173-205). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind in society. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wells, G. (1990). Creating the conditions to encourage literate thinking. Educational Leadership, 47, 13-17.

Table 1

Categories of Topics Introduced into Discussion and Frequency of Occurrence
Across Twelve Stories.

Topic Category	Number (%) CU'S
Literary Elements: Participants discussed elements of stories, e.g., character, theme.	172 (30.2)
Illustrations: Participants made observations about the illustrations in the picture book.	118 (20.7)
Familiarity with Literature: Participants displayed their knowledge and curiosity regarding books , authors/illustrators, genre.	84 (14.8)
Language: Participants talked about language as a rule-governed system.	97 (17.0)
Personal Experiences: Participants linked the stories to their personal lives.	78 (14.0)
Book Features: Participants talked about book features, e.g. dedications, end pages.	19 (3.3)
Total CU'S	568 (100 %)

PURPOSES SERVED IN TWELVE STORY DISCUSSIONS

PURPOSES SERVED	FREQUENCY	DEFINITION	EXAMPLE
ASSOCIATION	115 (20%)	Linked personal experiences at home and at school, as well as other literary works with stories.	T: ¿Cómo se sintieron cuando dormieron en la casa de otra persona? [How did you feel when you spent the night at someone else's house?] C: Y fui con mi abuelita pero no traje mi "bear." [I went with my grandmother, but I didn't bring my bear.] T: ¿No llevaste tu bear? Te dio miedo para dormir en otra casa? ¿No? He said he slept at his grandma's and he didn't get scared. Adam? C: My mom, she didn't like me . . . um . . . going my friend, but . . . but she now learned that I'm big I can go. T: When you're older you're gonna go spend the night with your friend. ¿Katherine? C: Una vez me dio miedo a la casa de Fernanda, una amiga. [One time I got scared at Fernanda's house. She's a friend.] T: ¿Fernanda? ¿María Fernanda? Yo la conozco. ¿Fuiste a la casa de ella? [I know her. Did you go to her house?] C: Sí. [Yes]
DESCRIPTION	110 (19%)	Described observations in illustrations, characters, sequences of events and background knowledge about story topic.	C: Ms. Contreras. Ms. Contreras. I know about that doll. That wooden doll. T: These? C: Yeah. You take them out and there's a baby one inside. T: That's right. They are all different sizes in here. I forgot what they're called. The dolls, they are all different sizes. Ms. Barker collects them. C: Le quitas uno. Le quitas otro y otro. (You take one off. You take off another and another.) T: I never noticed that's what it was. Thank you for noticing that. The mouse is inside a doll. El ratón está dentro de una muñeca. C: They didn't put a face on it. T: No. But there's the head. See?

PURPOSES SERVED	FREQUENCY	DEFINITION	EXAMPLE
INTERPRETATION	77 (14%)	Made inferences from the story about character motives and traits, setting, and events based on their own knowledge and values.	T: You think he's jealous because Willie has wheels? He wants the wheels? He wants the key? What does Alexander want? C: He wants to be like the other mouse. T: Why? C: 'Cause they hurt him. C: 'Cause everybody loves him. T: Everybody loves him. That's right. Everybody loves Willie. Do they love Alexander? C: No. C: No. They hit him with the broom and they . . . C: They throw flying saucers at him!
INQUIRY	68 (12%)	Sought confirmation and clarification about aspects of story that seemed unclear.	C: ¿Cómo agarraron la niña? [How did the horses get away with the girl?] T: Porque la muchacha se subió al caballo y iba corriendo bien recio. [Because the girl got on the horse and it went running very fast.]
TELLING	62 (11%)	Informed about story topic, meaning of words, titles, authors/illustrators.	T: Do you know what a tutu is? C: No. T: It's this costume. C: It's a little dress. T: It's a little dress.
ENACTMENT	45 (8%)	Recited, repeated, chanted or dramatized story or story language.	C: (Several children with special voice inflection say together) . . . Has anyone seen my dumpling?" C: Ay, ¡Pedro! T: Good voice disguise there!

PURPOSES SERVED	FREQUENCY	DEFINITION	EXAMPLE
WONDERING	29 (6%)	Posed and explored possible solutions and explanations for character's situations and puzzled over questions beyond the text.	T: He didn't know if he [the sabertooth tiger] was gone or not. [Se quedó en el árbol. Tenía miedo. Toda la noche se quedó en el árbol. En la madrugada es cuando habló con el perro. C: What about . . . uh . . . why did the Mom didn't call him? C: Where's the Mom? T: There's another good question. Where is his Mom? C: At home. T: Maybe she's at home cooking.
CRITICISM	26 (5%)	Evaluated specific events, and stories, in general. Offered their opinions, judgments, and comments of the value or worth of the story.	T: If you like this story, clap your hands once. C: I don't like it. T: What didn't you like about it? C: I didn't like it. T: Would you have wanted it to be different? C: Because the dog didn't have no food, and it was sad.
PREDICTION	26 (5%)	Offered hypotheses about how the story will progress.	T: Where do you think she went? C: To her house. T: She went to her house.

Table 2

No. and (Percentage) of Occurrence of Purposes Served in Twelve
Story Discussions

Purposes Served	No. (%) CU'S
Association	115 (20)
Description	110 (19)
Interpretation	77 (14)
Inquiry	68 (12)
Telling	62 (11)
Enactment	45 (8)
Wondering	29 (6)
Criticism	26 (5)
Prediction	26 (5)
Totals	568 (100%)

Table 3
Number and Percentage (%) of Child- and Teacher-Contributed
 Message Units (MU'S) in Twelve Story Discussions.

Story	Child MU'S No. (%)	Teacher MU'S No. (%)	Total MU'S
Willie	109 (47.6)	120 (52.4)	229
Grace	136 (44.0)	173 (56.0)	309
Abiyoyo	146 (49.8)	147 (50.2)	293
Legend	157 (44.9)	193 (55.1)	350
Ira	125 (61.3)	79 (38.7)	204
Alexander	220 (50.5)	216 (49.5)	436
Ben	247 (49.9)	248 (50.1)	495
Funny	172 (51.0)	165 (49.0)	337
Hen	193 (52.9)	172 (47.1)	365
Horses	135 (51.9)	125 (48.1)	260
Dog	193 (47.3)	215 (52.7)	408
Pictures	219 (41.3)	311 (58.7)	530
Total MU'S	2052	2164	4216
Average MU'S	171 (48.7)	180 (51.3)	351

Table 4
Patterns and Frequencies of Teacher- and Child-Initiated Turn-
Taking in Twelve Story Discussions

Turn taking Patterns	Teacher Terminations	No. CU'S	Child Terminations	No. CU's	Total Initiations
Teacher Initiations	TCT	60	TC	48	225
	TC..T	17	TC...	18	
	TC..TC..T	55	TC..TC..	57	
Child Initiations	CT	62	C...C	24	169
	C..T	17	C..TC..	41	
	C..TC..T	22	CTC...	3	

Table 5

Frequency and Percentage (%) of Occurrence of Teacher Strategies
Across Twelve Stories.

Teacher strategy	No. and (%) CU'S
Elicits answer	251 (14.9)
Informs	260 (15.4)
Recapitulates text	66 (3.9)
Elicits reading	25 (1.5)
Invites	311 (18.5)
Accepts student response	481 (28.5)
Gives opportunity to talk	170 (10.0)
Shares personal response	103 (6.1)
models thinking about text	18 (1.0)
Total MU's	1685 (100)